

indulging those extravagant expectations as to their conversion which are sometimes ascribed to us. There never yet has been on earth a whole people thoroughly Catholic in faith and practice. In the best of times, in the most pious of nations, there has always been a large number of what are called "Hickory Catholics," that is, of men who will fight to the death for their faith, and die sooner than live it. We never expect the time when there will be none but Catholics in the land, or when all who are Catholics will be good Catholics. Nor is it necessary for the security of our institutions. To this end it is only necessary that the Church should be here, with her faith, her morality, and the example of her faithful children, and that she have a predominating influence on the ruling mind and heart of the country. She will affect it by diffusing Catholic life, and keeping fresh and living those old Catholic doctrines and traditions of authority and liberty which form the basis of modern civilization, and especially of the civil and political institutions of this country. These doctrines and traditions may and do operate in minds out of the Church; they were vigorous in the minds of the founders of our Republic; but without the Church they become obscure and gradually lose their force, as we see now in all non-Catholic nations. Protestant nations brought them away from the Church with them when they separated from her; but they have used them up, or lost sight of them. Hence the decay of patriotism, of public spirit, and personal and political integrity, the growing dishonesty, and increasing vice and profligacy in public and private life, which are every where now so threatening. They need to be revived and re-invigorated by fresh draughts from their source. But all we need for their revival in force, and to enable Catholicity to protect us, is that they be restored to their dominion, and become the public thought and conscience of the majority of the American people. We want them to form the governing mind of the country, and be acknowledged as the rule of our conduct, whether as individuals or as the state. This may be effected without every body in the Republic being converted, and without any direct intervention of the Church in secular affairs, even while a very considerable portion of the people remain non-Catholic. In this way the Church is doing a

great deal even now to protect us from anarchy and despotism, and would, even with our present numbers do a great deal more, if Catholics would exert the moral and intellectual influence of which they are capable.

In the remarks we have made we have aimed chiefly to answer the objection raised by our Protestant Reviewer. The proofs that the Catholic Church is God's Church, it has been no part of our purpose to adduce. We have simply vindicated our article on *The Church and the Republic*, and await now the response of our Boston Reviewer.

ART. II.—*The Catholic. Letters addressed by a Jurist to a young kinsman, proposing to join the Church of Rome.* By E. H. DERBY. Boston: Jewett & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 293.

WE concluded, in our Review for October last, our first article devoted to the dissection of Mr. Derby's Letters to his Son, by some remarks on the comparison he suggests between Catholic and Protestant nations, under the point of view of civilization. We have something more to say on that subject. His argument is the one just now chiefly relied on by English and American Protestants. He says, in summing up his argument:

"Now I submit this argument as to the Romish faith being a departure from the Gospel, that the true design of Christianity was to refine, improve, and civilize, not debase the world; and if we find a system has departed from the simplicity of the Gospel, and has been attended by debasement and degradation, while the Reformation has been attended with different results, that system cannot be true."—pp. 10, 11.

If it were a fact that Catholicity *morally or spiritually* debases and degrades the nations that embrace and faithfully follow it, we should argue, not that it is a departure from the Gospel, but that it is from Satan; for no man can distinguish between the Gospel and Catholicity. But the fact is not, and can not be proved. If on the other hand, it were proved, that Protestant nations are superior to Catholic nations under the point

of view of material civilization, in trade, industry, agriculture, wealth, physical power, all that may be included under the head of the good things of this world, we should not infer that it is Christianity, or true religion, for we have seen a more advanced civilization of that sort than any Protestant nation can boast, obtain among the more renowned nations of antiquity, and because to that sort of civilization nothing distinctively Christian is needed. Great Britain, we take it, is the greatest and most prosperous of all Protestant nations; and yet Great Britain is less advanced in material or natural civilization than were Pagan Greece and Rome, Tyre and Sidon, Egypt and Assyria. If she can claim any superiority over any of them, it is in her moral civilization, which she owes not to her Protestantism, but to Christianity, for which, as far as Christianity she has, she is indebted to the Catholic Church. Protestantism has no doubt aided her material progress, by loosening her from the moral and spiritual restraints imposed by Catholicity, and leaving her free to devote her genius, her skill, and her energy, to the production, exchange, or accumulation of the good things of this world. This is the real sense of the English Protestant's boast, and more than this no Protestant can seriously claim for the Reformation in England. But in this the service rendered by Protestantism is not a service rendered by presenting, but by removing Christianity, and assimilating the nation to a heathen nation, free to devote herself body and soul to the material order. She has needed for her material progress, no distinctively Christian principle, no supernatural religion, nothing, in fact, but her own natural powers.

Great Britain, if she surpasses contemporary Catholic nations, surpasses them only under the point of view of material civilization. Now, if we analyze her alleged superiority, we shall find that it lies in the natural order, and depends on nature alone. The virtues in which she is supposed to excel are the natural virtues, not the peculiarly Christian virtues, unattainable without supernatural revelation, and the infused habit of divine grace. We say not by this that they are not virtues, that in their own order they are not good; we only say that they are not Christian virtues, virtues impossible without

Christianity. The English are a brave and hardy people, and as a military and naval power Great Britain is unsurpassed by any modern nation,—as a naval power equalled by none. But what has Christianity to do with this? Does Christianity, nay, does Protestantism, regarded as a religion, teach and strengthen her to raise, discipline, and marshal troops, to construct ships, man and manœuvre fleets? The ancients did these things on as grand a scale as she does them, and did so without Christianity. Alexander, Hannibal, Julius Cæsar, rank heathens, were as great generals, as perfect masters of tactics or strategics, as Marlborough, Wellington, or my Lord Raglan, and won as remarkable victories as those of Blenheim, Waterloo, or the Alma. I am aware of nothing in the science or the art of war, whether on the sea or the land, that demands the supernatural aid of Christianity, that transcends the natural powers of man, or that has been supplied supernaturally through the Gospel. Gunpowder was a human invention, not a divine revelation, and human genius sufficed to invent Colt's Revolver, and the Minié Rifle. Nelson manœuvred his fleet in the Nile, at Copenhagen, and at Trafalgar, as a man, as a brave man and a good sailor,—not as a Christian, and proceeded on principles learned by human genius, not on principles revealed in the Gospel. I do not say that England owes her military and naval greatness to the violation of Christian principles, or that she has attained it without the concurrence of Divine Providence, but I do say that she has attained it by natural powers,—powers which she derives not from Christianity, but from nature, and holds, in common with the ancient heathen as well as with modern unchristian nations. Whether she has attained to it by a just or an unjust exercise of these powers is not now the question. Some may say that she has attained to it only by exercising them unjustly, and, that, if she had been more observant of the Christian law, she would never have attained to her present military and naval superiority. They may be right; on that point we express no opinion; but what we insist upon is, that she owes it not to religion, but to nature,—to the exercise of her natural powers, not to her natural powers supernaturalized by grace. Therefore, her greatness is

natural greatness, as was that of Greece and Rome, and says nothing in favor of Protestantism as Christianity. It is no argument in favor of her Protestantism as a supernatural religion. It says no more for Protestantism than the military success of Miltiades, Themistocles, Cyrus, Sesostris, Alexander, Hannibal, Scipio Africanus, or Julius Cæsar says for ancient Greek, Persian, Egyptian, Phœnician, or Roman Paganism. We might as well draw an argument in favor of Mahometanism, from the military greatness of the Caliphs, or of the Turkish Sultans, as from the military and naval greatness of Great Britain in favor of Protestantism.

The next thing that strikes us in Great Britain is her commercial and industrial greatness; but what has Christianity to do with this? Did the English learn from the Christian revelation, or from the Church of England, as by law established, to build ships, to navigate the ocean, to buy cheap and sell dear? Did they derive from divine revelation the steam engine, the spinning jenny, and the power loom? Great Britain's trade and industry, commerce and manufactures, depend on her natural genius, skill, and enterprise, to which her Protestantism adds nothing. If these are due to her Protestantism, how do you explain the commercial and industrial greatness of the Phœnicians, the Greeks, and the Carthaginians in the ancient world, and of the Italian Republics, Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, in the Middle Ages? or that of Portugal in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and of the Hanseatic Towns, and the Low Countries long before Satan taught Luther that private Masses are sinful, or Luther himself symbolized the rehabilitation of the flesh by espousing the Nun, Catherine Bora? These things do not depend on religion, but on the natural order, the natural genius, powers, habits, tendencies, and opportunities of individuals or of nations. Great Britain has availed herself of her natural powers, of her geographical position, and of the natural genius of her people, and is to-day the first commercial and industrial nation of the world. All you can say of her Protestantism is, that it has left her free to do so. It has not turned her attention to spiritual and heavenly things; it has not restrained her by directing her efforts to the achievement of great-

ness in the order of sanctity, and impressing upon her heart the comparative worthlessness of all she lives and labors for. In this way it has no doubt favored her growth in material wealth, but it has done so, not by virtue of what it gives, but by virtue of what it removes, not by the supernatural aid it brings to our natural powers, but by the freedom it leaves to our worldly and selfish instincts and tendencies.

The last thing we mention in which a certain superiority is claimed for Great Britain is her political constitution. She boasts of her freedom, civil and religious. As to her political and civil constitution, she owes it in great part to Catholic times, and any improvements she has made since the Reformation she has required nothing more to effect them than natural religion, restored by Christianity, and kept alive even in non-Catholic countries by the presence in the world of the Catholic Church. As to religious liberty, the less said the better. She does not recognize it any where in the United Kingdom. Her own Church, the Church of England, is bound hand and foot, is the slave of the State, and has not the least autonomy. It is part and parcel of the political and civil constitution of the kingdom. No modern state has been so cruel and unrelenting a persecutor as England. After two hundred years and more of cruel persecution she has during the last half century been trying the policy, not of religious liberty, but of religious toleration,—a policy which she seems half inclined to abandon. Her civil liberty is maintained not by her Protestantism, but in spite of it, for it cannot be forgotten that it was English Protestantism that sustained the absolutist pretensions of the Tudors and the Stuarts, and taught the doctrine of the divine right of kings, passive obedience, and the irresponsibility of power. Whatever ameliorations we note in the English government, whether in relation to civil or religious liberty, we find they have been effected, not by English Protestantism, but chiefly in spite of it, in opposition to it, by men who have a natural sense of justice, but very little belief in any revealed religion. If the truth must be told, the progress of religious toleration in Great Britain and of religious liberty in this country during the last and

present centuries, is due far more to the great infidel writers and statesmen of the time than to Protestants or Protestantism, that is, due far more to men who recognize the natural order, and rely on natural reason and virtue, than to those Protestants who still adhere to Protestantism as a supernatural religion,—to the men who, weary of theological discussions, have discarded all belief in the supernatural, who are indifferent, and, like Gallio, care for none of these things.

In any point of view, then, in which we may consider the greatness of the British nation, we must ascribe it first to the Catholic traditions which she has not wholly rejected, and secondly to her natural virtues, as we ascribe the greatness of Pagan Rome to her bravery, fortitude, prudence, and energy. It all lies in the natural order, and requires only the natural powers of man to produce it, as was the case with the greatness of ancient Pagan nations. However much superior the material civilization of Great Britain may be to that of any Catholic nation, it affords and can afford no argument to prove that Protestantism is Christianity; for if any thing be certain, it is that Christianity was not given to promote material civilization, and that that civilization is easily explained without it, on simple natural principles. It contains nothing which excelled the natural powers of man.

"The true design of Christianity," says Mr. Derby, "was to refine, improve, and civilize, not debase the world." "Not debase the world," we agree; but that its true design, the end for which it was given, was to refine, improve, and civilize the world, if you understand material civilization, we deny. That Christianity does refine, improve, and civilize the world, in a moral and spiritual sense, is certainly true; but its true design is to redeem men from sin, to sanctify them, and elevate them to union with God in the beatific vision; and it regards this world only as it may be made subservient to that design,—this life only in its relation to that which is to come—the life after death. Its direct object is the glory of God in the salvation and everlasting happiness of men hereafter. It is in this world, but it operates always and every where in relation to another, and affects the condition of men in this world, and in relation to this life, only incidentally,

1857.]

indirectly, or as a means to an end. It does not come into the world as a political or social reformer, a merchant, a manufacturer, a broker, or a railroad financier; and has nothing to do with them, further than to tell them it profits a man nothing, if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul; and to impress upon them their obligations to maintain justice and honesty in all their transactions. Christianity, Mr. Derby himself will concede, if he reflects a moment, is a spiritual kingdom, the kingdom of God on earth,—instituted for the direction and government of men in this world indeed, but not for this world; and the goods it proposes, and commands and aids us to seek [are not the goods of this earthly life, but the goods of the life to come. Its mission is not to make us rich in this world's wealth, but to make us godly. Hence our Lord bids us seek, not the goods of this life, for that is what the heathen do, but the kingdom of God and His justice,—to set our affections on things above, to labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life; and says, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth; where the rust and the moth consume, and thieves dig through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither the rust nor the moth doth consume, and where thieves neither dig through nor steal."* This is undeniably the teaching of Christianity, and its influence is undoubtedly to make us prefer spiritual to material goods, to detach us from this world, and moderate our desires for the much boasted material civilization of our age. It is true, our Lord says, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and *all these things—the goods of this life—shall be added unto you.*" But the *adjicienda* are not proposed as the end, or as the reason why we are to seek the kingdom of God and His justice. They are not offered as the prize to be run after, and are not added because sought, but because they are not sought. No doubt the Christian is a happier man in this world than the non-Christian, but he is so precisely because he lives not for this world, is above it while in it, and has in living for another world, a never-failing source of internal joy and

* St. Matt. vi. 19, 20, 31-33.

consolation which this world can neither give nor take away. In teaching and aiding men to live for truth and justice, for God and heaven, in filling their hearts with Christian love and humility, in moderating their worldly desires, and in subduing their passions, it undoubtedly refines, improves, and civilizes the world, as an incidental or indirect effect, so that human society even in this world is in fact a great gainer by Christianity. But this is not its direct aim, its direct end, the end for which our Lord came into the world, instituted and sustains his religion. To suppose it, were to suppose Christians had no higher aim than had the heathen, and to fall into the error of the old carnal Jews, who applied the prophecies to this life, expected in the Messiah a temporal prince, and rejected our Lord because he came only as a spiritual prince, teaching self-denial and detachment from the world, and promising his followers, not temporal greatness and prosperity as their reward, but eternal life in the world to come.

If this be so, the Christian criterion for judging the respective merits of Catholic and Protestant countries is not that which our jurist and railroad financier has chosen, nay, not that which is chosen by most of the enemies of the Church in Great Britain and the United States. The Christian test is not and cannot be that of material civilization. Be it true, if you will it, that Protestant nations surpass in material greatness and prosperity Catholic nations, it does not move us. The question turns not on that civilization, for that is in the natural order, and not in the Christian order, even when not opposed to it; but it turns on the moral and spiritual virtues of Catholics and Protestants respectively. In examining a Catholic country we are to form our judgment from the moral and spiritual virtues, the sanctity, the heavenly tone and temper, the pure and elevated spirit of the individuals who belong to the Catholic communion, and who believe firmly what the Church teaches and observe faithfully whatever she directs or commands. If we find in her communion a single saint made so by believing her doctrines and obedience to her precepts and her counsels, she must be accepted as the Christian Church, for the forming of one saint is, in the Christian

judgment, a greater work of God than all His other works besides. Now take this criterion, a criterion, which not even Mr. Derby will dare refuse to accept, and we shall find that the assumption that Catholicity is attended by debasement and degradation, and Protestantism by the reverse, or by different results, is rashly made, and is wholly unwarranted by the facts in the case.

We do not suppose that Mr. Derby consciously holds that material civilization is the real end of Christianity, or the supreme good of man or of society. No man born and bred in a community once Christianized can believe any such thing. He no doubt holds that the moral is above the material, and the eternal above the temporal. But some how or other he blends the two together, and regards them either as inseparably connected, or one as uniformly the measure of the other. His difficulty is to separate worldly prosperity and material greatness from Christian sanctity, and poverty from degradation, vice, and crime. He is unable to separate thrift and godliness, and to comprehend that godliness is itself a great gain. He cannot grasp the radical distinction between Christianity and Judaism as a national institution. The Jew was promised a temporal reward for his fidelity to the law given by Moses, and Mr. Derby has a confused thought that it must be the same with the Christian; that he too is promised temporal prosperity as his reward for fidelity to the law of Christ. The Mosaic law was a temporary and a temporal institution, and therefore obedience to it was rewarded by temporal prosperity, and disobedience by temporal adversity; but Christianity is spiritual, and the rewards and punishments it contemplates are like itself spiritual and eternal. Under the Christian law men are judged for what they are in themselves, not by their worldly position or possessions. Our Lord nowhere connects poverty with vice or disgrace, or riches with sanctity and honor. He judges not as the world judges. There was a certain man whose grounds brought forth abundantly, and who had to enlarge his barns and storehouses. Having filled them, he said to himself, Soul, eat, drink, and enjoy thyself, for thou hast goods laid up for thee for many years. Thou fool, said our Lord, this night shall God demand thy soul. Here, what the world calls wisdom God

calls folly. Let us understand that the Gospel neither proposes, encourages, nor smiles upon this material civilization, and never confounds it or inseparably connects it with moral and spiritual civilization,—that practice of justice and charity, that love of truth and sanctity which characterize the truly Christian nation. Let us understand this. Christianity judges not the eternal by the temporal, but the temporal by the eternal, the seen by the unseen, the human by the divine, and counts a thing good or evil as it does or does not contribute to the ultimate end of man, union with God in the beatific vision. In the judgment of the true Christian, that social or civilized state will rank highest which offers fewest obstacles to the growth of individuals in the peculiarly Christian virtues, and that nation will stand highest in which these virtues are most abundant, although it may be lowest in regard to trade, manufactures, agriculture, the mechanic arts, and military power. That poor beggar woman who truly loves her God, and lives the life of faith and hope, stands infinitely above that proud lordling, rolling in wealth and thinking only of his own gratifications. Lazarus was infinitely above the rich man at whose gate he lay, and with the crumbs from whose table he begged to be fed. This is a solemn truth, if there be any truth in Christianity. Mr. Derby does not perhaps, any more than thousands of others, lay this to heart, and he may be unconsciously regarding his worldly prosperity as the measure of his growth in sanctity; but even he dare not deny the superiority in the sight of God of Lazarus whose sores the dogs came and licked, to the rich man who fared sumptuously every day, and who when he died went to hell. Like too many of his countrymen, he no doubt associates poverty and sin, and wealth and virtue, but he knows that in doing so he is not judging as a Christian, hardly as a man of natural good sense.

Now let us as Christians compare Catholic and non-Catholic nations. Mr. Derby asserts that the Catholic system has been attended by debasement and degradation, and that the Reformation has been attended with different results. Is this the fact? We will take a case the most favorable to the Protestant and the least favorable to the Catholic, that can be selected. We will take Protestant

England and Catholic Ireland. England is the country of all others in which Protestantism has had the fairest scope for its development, and where it has been best able during three hundred years to prove its capabilities. Catholic Ireland is the country of all others where Catholicity has labored under the greatest worldly disadvantages. Catholic Ireland has been governed as a conquered country, and governed too by Protestants. The government for three hundred years has been Protestant, and till within the last quarter of a century has done all in its power to trammel the Catholic religion, and to debase and degrade the Catholic population. It deprived Catholics of all political power; it robbed them of all their churches, schools, and seminaries, outlawed their religion, hunted down their clergy as wild beasts, and prohibited, by heavy penalties, all education by Catholics, even the teaching of letters to his child by a Catholic father. It seized all the revenues of the Church, confiscated the estates of Catholic proprietors, even prohibited Catholics from acquiring landed property, or of owning a horse of more than five pounds value. In a word, the Protestant government aided by a Protestant faction in Ireland, far worse than the government itself, has during three hundred years done all in its power to impoverish, to debase, and brutalize the Catholic population. Well, compare Catholic Ireland and Protestant England as we find them to-day, and say which stands highest, judged by the Christian standard? I deny not that there are many Irishmen at home and abroad who are no credit to their religion; I deny not that there are many Irishisms which are not to my taste, and that sometimes annoy me; but no man competent to judge can for one moment hesitate to assert that in a moral and religious point of view, in moral dignity of character, and in the peculiar Christian virtues, those which have the promise of eternal life, the pre-eminence belongs unmistakably to the Catholic Irish. Catholic Ireland is far more moral than Protestant England, has absolutely and relatively fewer crimes, fewer vices, and far less intemperance. You look in vain for that moral debasement and degradation among the Irish peasantry that you meet at every step in the English peasantry, operatives, and miners. Your humblest Irishman who has not lost his religion, has a self-

respect, a politeness, an elevation of feeling, a true manliness, a moral perception, a nobility of sentiment, that an Englishman of the same rank in life, not only has not, but is usually unable even to conceive. In all Catholic countries you cannot fail to remark in the lower classes, if they retain their faith, that they are never so low as the corresponding classes in other countries. They never feel that because they are poor they cease to be human, or that they are of a different nature from the rich.

Catholic Ireland, I concede, is not as rich as Protestant England; but when you take into consideration the circumstances in which the Catholic Irish have been placed, the legislation that for so long a time rendered their property, if they had any, insecure, and operated to prevent them from acquiring property, you must concede that in true industry and thrift, those cardinal virtues in the estimation of New Englanders, they have proved themselves in no sense inferior to the English. We are more struck by the fact that they have been able to live, have contrived to keep soul and body together, than we are by the immense accumulations of Protestant England. In strength of body, in physical courage, in all manly exercises, in ingenuity, in all that tries or develops one's manhood, the Irishman is at least equal to the Englishman of the same class. The English are superior to the Irish, only in the genius of organization,—a natural, not an acquired superiority. The Irish genius, like that of all the Celtic tribes, is disintegrating, and in politics yields to the English, as the old Gallic tribes yielded to the Romans, although surpassing them in numbers, and equalling them in courage and military ardor. The reason of this difference I cannot explain, but it is not owing to difference of religion, for it was as striking when England and Ireland were both Catholic as it is now. This genius of organization, which makes a people a king-people, and fits it to be a robber as well as a moral people, and its material conquests and accumulations, with the physical power growing out of them, are all that Protestant England can boast over Catholic Ireland. In all else, the Catholic Irish, allowance made for the oppression they have suffered from power in the hands of Protestants, are far above the Protestant English. The Protestant Englishman is

prouder; does not doubt that he is a greater and a better man; he walks the earth with a sturdier step, and speaks in a louder and a gruffer tone; but he will be found on examination to be inferior to the Catholic Irishman in mental quickness and activity, in intelligence, wisdom, virtue, politeness, and grace.

But this is not all, nor the most. We would ask Mr. Derby to tell us what has during these three hundred years sustained the Catholic Irish, and saved them from utter moral debasement and degradation. The high moral character, the deep sense of religion, the stern virtues, the noble sentiments which mark the majority of the Catholic Irish, must be conceded; but how have they maintained them in spite of the efforts made for three hundred years to brutalize them, and to crush the life out of them? How have they been able to preserve one of the finest national characters in the world, and to give to the humblest shealing a dignity and moral grandeur and beauty which not one of England's proudest palaces can surpass? No man can for one moment doubt that it has been the Catholic religion, the Catholic faith, the Catholic Church. A Protestant people under similar circumstances, would have sunk to a condition but one remove from that of the brute creation. That it is Catholicity which has sustained the Irish in their virtues and noble sentiments is evident from the fact that the Irishman loses them the moment he loses his religion, or turns his back upon the old Church. The Protestant Irish have no superiority over the Protestant English. If, as is undeniable, the Catholic Irish are not utterly debased and degraded, and if it is due to the Catholic religion that they are not, how can Mr. Derby pretend that debasement and degradation necessarily attend the Catholic system? The Jurist would have a good case, if the facts did not happen to be dead against him. As long as stands Catholic Ireland, so long he must concede that a Catholic people cannot by all the arts and contrivances, by all the malice and force of earth and hell, be utterly debased and degraded. Catholic Ireland, say what you will of her, stands there a living answer to the proud conceited Protestant's charge that Catholicity is unfavorable to the refinement, the improvement, the civilization of the world, and we ask no

other answer to Mr. Derby's ill-considered and ill-chosen argument against our religion.

We are far from pretending that all in Catholic States satisfies us, and have no disposition to deny to Protestant States any thing good which they can claim as their own; but we tell Mr. Derby that if he speaks as a Christian, the refining, civilizing effects of the Reformation he assumes exist only in his imagination, or the exigencies of his argument. They are nowhere to be seen. In Protestant countries you find in the middle classes a certain rough energy, a certain barbaric pride, which talks large, and which owing to its devotion to the world commands a certain measure of material success, not ordinarily to be met with in Catholics devoted to their religion, but in the arts, graces, refinements, and charms of civilized life, the latter are every where in advance of the former. A careful comparison of the two will establish the fact that in material civilization, in the purely material order, in which infidels and Christians stand on the same footing, Protestants take the precedence, though still behind the more advanced heathen nations of antiquity; but in that higher civilization which regards the heart and soul, and demands for its attainment and maintenance the Christian virtues, temper, and spirit, the only civilization the Christian prizes, Catholics take the precedence, in reality stand alone. We conclude, therefore, that the Reformation, while it gives free scope to the material splendor and aggrandizement of a nation, tends directly to its moral debasement and degradation, and that Catholicity, while it detaches men from the world, moderates the desire for worldly goods, and therefore in some measure checks the growth of a rank and poisonous material civilization, fosters the spiritual, ennobles the soul, purifies the affections, elevates the sentiments, and renders man a higher and a more dignified being, and society more simple, just, and humane, in which moral worth is held in higher honor, and the poor and unfortunate are treated with more consideration, gentleness, and affection, nay, respect.

We have treated this argument at greater length than its intrinsic importance demands, because it contains the only objection to Catholicity that has much practical weight with our non-Catholic countrymen, and because we

have wished to show that it is at bottom, so far as it is an argument at all, an argument against Christianity itself, and based upon principles which every one who believes in the Gospel does and must reject. Mr. Derby does not see this, because he does not see any difficulty in serving, at the same time, both God and mammon, or very clearly distinguish the worship of mammon from the worship of God. Yet nothing is more certain than that this devotion to the world, to the development and advancement of material civilization, which leads us to estimate nations and individuals by their wealth and worldly greatness, which treats the poor as vicious or criminal, and regards them as the curse and opprobrium of a country, which even our Protestant ministers eulogize from the pulpit, the press, and the rostrum, as an evidence of our enlightenment and true wisdom, is incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel, offensive to God, and injurious to society itself. It implies a forgetfulness of God, and the nations that forget God must sooner or later experience the fate of all the great nations of pagan antiquity. The men who live for this world, in the long run, lose this world and that which is to come; and all experience proves that you can never increase a man's happiness by enlarging his material possessions. One of our old New England worthies, who amassed a large estate, and was a man of note in his day, used to say that he and his wife when married were both poor, that he told her he wished to be rich, but she told him that she did not wish to be rich, she only wished to be comfortable. "I have," he would add, "long since had my wish, but she has not yet had hers." He was a wiser man than Mr. Derby who said, "If you would enrich a man, study not to increase his possessions, but to moderate his desires." The contented poor man is richer than he whom the world calls rich, is in fact more independent, and can do more as he likes. Our desires increase with the increase of our riches, riches bring cares and responsibilities which render them a snare to the bad man, and a burden to the good man.

But enough of this. We must proceed in our dissection to other, though hardly graver matters.

"Again, let me recur to the origin of the Romish Church. Its basis should be the Gospel. Here we have a safe starting-point.

All denominations recognize the mission of our Saviour, and the authority of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. Now how far do these sacred books establish the faith, doctrines, and usages of the Romish Church? First, the Church of Rome relies upon the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew, eighteenth verse, in which our Saviour says, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.' But we must remember that in the same chapter, verse twenty-third, our Saviour rebukes Peter in terms stronger than he used to any apostle, save Judas, who betrayed him, saying, 'Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me.' And we must not forget that in the hour of trial Peter faltered, that he thrice denied our Lord, and, drawing a sword against the wishes of our Saviour, wounded a servant of the high-priest, because he stated the truth."—p. 11.

Mr. Derby would do well to remember that Catholics hold that our Lord himself founded the Church, not that men have founded it, whether on the Gospel or any thing else. In the mind of the Catholic the Church is Jesus Christ's own institution of the Gospel, and it is the Gospel instituted as a living kingdom, not as an abstract idea, or a dead book, that we embrace and hold to be authoritative. Out of the Church, and distinguished from her, there is no Gospel for men to appeal to, or to recognize as authority. The Gospel is what the Church teaches and administers. The written word can be cited against her only for the purpose of convicting her of contradicting herself. For such a purpose you may cite it against her, but for no other. Mr. Derby is a lawyer, and should understand this. She is the court, and he must dispossess her before he can make her amenable to his reading of the law. But this by the way.

Where our Lord says to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and on this Rock I will build my Church," he does not mean, Mr. Derby thinks, what he says, because he subsequently rebukes Peter in severer terms than he used to any other disciple save Judas. But did not our Lord know very well when he said, "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, and I say unto thee, thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my Church," that he would also have occasion very soon to say unto him, "Go behind me, Satan?" Whence then does it follow from the rebuke that the promise so formally made was not made, or that it was to be of none effect? Mr. Derby must concede that, not-

withstanding the rebuke, Peter remained one of the twelve, and was commissioned and sent forth as an inspired Apostle, and, it seems to me, that if his reasoning is good against the Primacy, it is equally good against the Apostleship of Peter. Peter denied his Lord thrice, and even cursed and swore. In that he proved himself as unworthy of being an Apostle even as of being the prince of the Apostles. Yet our Lord did not exclude him from the Apostolic college. The learned jurist forgets that our Lord in the promise spoke in the future, and that it was not till converted that Peter was to confirm his brethren. It was possible for Peter, through divine grace, to repent, and I have never heard it maintained that our Lord chose Peter because he was naturally a perfect character. "Ye have not chosen me," said our Lord to all his Apostles, "but I have chosen you." Their Apostleship stood not in human virtue, but in divine appointment, divine grace, and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. So also the Primacy of Peter, and whatever the natural imperfections of Peter's character, we suppose it lay in our Lord's power to qualify him for the office to which he designated him, whether that office was the Primacy or some other.

There is something hard-hearted and unchristian in our Protestant Jurist. We fear he has never learned to temper justice with mercy, and is very far from duly appreciating the infinite tenderness of the Gospel, or from sounding the depth of the riches of divine grace. He sees in our Lord's severe language only an evidence of his anger to Peter, and concludes that our Lord could not have rebuked him without withdrawing the blessing he had pronounced upon him. He cannot understand that our Lord may rebuke in love, and chastise without anger. He will allow no space for repentance, no scope for mercy and forgiveness. He would have been greatly scandalized had he been present when our Lord dined with the Pharisee, and had seen him permit, while he sat at table, Mary Magdalen, the woman who had been a sinner, to wash his feet with her tears and wipe them with her hair. He most likely would have called for the police to transport her to the House of Correction. Alas! the smile of innocence can no longer light up any of our faces, but the tears of penitence may stream from the eyes of us all, and dear are

these tears to our Lord, who came to call not the just, but sinners to repentance, and who while we were yet sinners died for us, and opens his arms and his heart to the very chiefest of sinners, if he repents. He did not spurn the penitent Magdalen, but received her homage, bestowed on her the riches of his grace, and made her as conspicuous for her burning charity as she had been for her disorderly love. Mr. Derby, ourselves, and thousands of others need this example of the Magdalen, this assurance that the tears of the penitent sinner can cleanse, through grace, the soul from its pollutions, and open to us the doors of Paradise, to save us from despair, and to permit us to feel that, if, like her, we repent and bedew the feet of our Lord with our tears, he will not spurn us, but enrich us with his love.

It is true, our Lord reproved Peter after he had blessed him and given him the promise; but not angrily, as if Peter had done something to forfeit his love. When our Lord said to his disciples that he "must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the ancients and the scribes and the chief priests, and be put to death, and the third day rise again," Peter rebuked him, and said, Lord, be it far from thee; this shall not be unto thee. But Peter said this, no doubt, as not understanding, at that time, that Christ must needs suffer, and from a tender love and respect to his Master. The reply of our Lord need not be taken in a harsh sense, and necessarily means no more than, Nay, Peter, in wishing these things not to befall me, thou savorest the things that be of men, not the things that be of God, and art opposed to me. These things must be, and instead of wishing to avert them, prepare to follow me, and suffer after my example. But be this as it may, why may it not be that our Lord chose Peter to be the prince of the Apostles, and the rock on which he would build his Church, because he was not free from human weakness, because he needed at times repentance and pardon, so that his elevation should not seem to be awarded to his natural virtues, so that he should find in it no temptation against humility, and so that it should be seen that his Church does not stand in human sagacity, wisdom, strength, or virtue, but in Divine grace, and the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost?

"Again, the Romish Church adverts to the gift of keys and relies on the nineteenth verse of the same chapter, but the ancient fathers attached little importance to this verse which so closely precedes the rebuke. Tertullian, of Carthage, who flourished in the next century after the apostles, says, 'Clavem interpretationem legis.' Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, says, 'Clavis est scientia scripturarum per quam aperitur janua veritatis.' Chrysostom lived in 393. Eusebius, who lived in 290, born in Palestine in 265, an able and voluminous writer, calls the keys 'the word of God.' These seem to be the earliest and most authentic of ancient expositors, and I can refer you to these passages and all others I may cite. What becomes, then, of the express delegation to St. Peter, claimed by the Romanists, of the exclusive custody of the gates of heaven."—pp. 11, 12.

Suppose this were so, what then? Tertullian and Eusebius were no saints; the former lapsed into the Montanist heresy, and the latter was affected by Arianism. Whether they say what Mr. Derby alleges, we are unable to say, as he gives no reference, and we have not deemed it worth our while to search through their voluminous works to see if we could find the alleged passages. According to Mr. Derby, or rather the Anglican divine from whom he cites him, Tertullian says, the "key is the interpretation of the Law." This, if it means any thing, must mean that the key is that which unlocks, or discloses the sense or true meaning of the law. If then Tertullian refers to the keys which our Lord said he would give to Peter, he must mean that our Lord gave to Peter the power to interpret and declare the true sense of the Law, that is, constituted him the judge of the law, as all Catholics hold. If Tertullian says what is alleged, he says nothing against the Catholic interpretation of the power of the keys. Eusebius, we are told, calls the keys "the word of God." This hardly agrees with what Tertullian says, for the interpretation of the word, and the word of God itself, are not precisely the same; but, suppose Eusebius does so call the keys, and that the keys are the word of God, it follows that as they were given to Peter, Peter received the word of God, and is constituted its keeper and interpreter. I see nothing in this inconsistent with the Catholic interpretation of the text.

I have not been able to verify the alleged citation from St. Chrysostom, and therefore know not, if he says it,

whether he is speaking of the keys given to Peter, or of some other key. He might very well say what is alleged, for the science of the Scriptures must have been included in the gift of the keys; but St. Chrysostom repeatedly calls St. Peter the "Mouth of the Disciples," the "Prince of the Apostles," the "Foundation of the Church," and distinctly asserts his primacy. In his third Homily on Penance, he says, "*Petrus ille apostolorum princeps, in Ecclesia primus, amicus Christi, qui revelationem ab hominibus non accepit, sed a Patre.... hic Petrus (Petrum cum dico, Petram nomino infragilem, crepidinem immobilem, apostolum magnum, primum discipulorum, primum vocatum, et primum obedientem): ille non parvum facinus admisit, sed maximum, qui Dominum negavit: hoc dico, non justum accusans, sed tibi poenitentiae praebens occasionem, &c.*"* St. Chrysostom says, also, what is very much to our purpose, in his seventh Oration, *Adversus Judaeos*, "*Petrus itaque post gravem illam negationem, quoniam celeriter suum ipsius peccatum recordatus est. Nulloque accusante dixit peccatum, flevitque amare; sic abluit illam abnegationem, ut etiam primus apostolorum fuerit factus, eique totus terrarum orbis commissus fuerit.*"† Again, arguing against the Anomæans and Arians, the holy doctor says, "*Nam Pater revelationem Filii Petro dedit. Filius vero et Patris et suam revelationem per totum orbem disseminavit, ac mortali homini omnem in caelo potestatem dedit, dum claves illi dedit.*" "He gave to mortal man all power in heaven, when he delivered to him (Peter) the keys."‡ This is sufficient to show how St. Chrysostom understood the keys, and the primacy of Peter, and as Mr. Derby concedes his authority, we hope he will be satisfied. It is a good thing to go to the "fountain heads," and perhaps had Mr. Derby gone there, he would not have written his Letters. But there was no need of citing the Fathers on this question. Every body knows that to deliver to one the keys, is symbolical of conferring power,

* Tom. 11. p. 359. C. D. I cite the Latin, after Mr. Derby's example, and not the Greek.

† Tom. 1, pp. 828, 829. C. D. I cite the edition of Gaume *Fratres*. Paris, 1839.

‡ In *Matthæum*, Homil. lrv al. lv, Tom. VII. p. 617. D. See, also, p. 616. A. et seq.

and what power our Lord conferred on Peter under the emblem of the keys is manifest from His own words: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."* This needs no comment. It is the unlimited power of binding and loosing, and that is all that I have ever understood the Church to mean by the power of the keys.

The assertion of Mr. Derby that the Fathers do not seem to attach much importance to the text in question, may go for what it is worth. A gratuitous assertion requires no refutation. In the early ages of the Church, it was not necessary to defend the primacy of Peter, or of the Apostolic See, for it was not disputed, and hence St. Augustine says, "Rome has spoken, sentence is pronounced, the cause is finished." The tradition was too fresh in men's minds to be questioned, and we should naturally expect to find little in the early Fathers in defence of it. The Church teaches orally, and her doctors do not ordinarily write in defence of her doctrines unless they are misapprehended or controverted. But the primacy of Peter never rested on this text alone, and the Fathers may have found other arguments more to their purpose, and even though they understood this as the Church now understands it, they may, without meaning to question or to obscure that understanding, have, as they have so many other texts, accommodated it to other senses.

"Again, the Romish Church relies on the words spoken to St. Peter, 'feed my sheep, feed my lambs,' the words of our Saviour. But our Saviour said to all his apostles, indifferently, 'feed ye,' 'go into the whole world,' 'teach ye the gospel.' Whatever power was given to St. Peter was not delegated to his successors by any words I find in the gospel. The Romish Church look principally to St. Peter, but it appears by holy writ that St. Paul was the *great apostle to the Gentiles*, and the principal if not the sole founder of the Church of Rome."—p. 12.

Suppose Mr. Derby is not able to find any words in the Gospel,—he means the Gospels,—which prove that the power, whatever it was, given to Peter was delegated

* St. Matt. xvi. 19.

to his successors, what does that prove? The Church is older than the Gospels, and was as completely constituted in all that is essential to her before a single one of the Gospels was written as she is now. If there is any truth at all in the Catholic Church, she receives her doctrine, her constitution, her laws, and her powers immediately from God, not through the medium of any written word whatever. This is her profession at any rate, and it is this profession you have to combat. The Church claims to have *received* the written word, but she must have existed before she received it, or else she could not have been its recipient. She does not concede that she has been created or constituted by the written word, as Mahometanism was instituted by the Koran. Our Lord, according to Catholics, founded a Church, instead of writing a book as the Arabian impostor did, and as Protestants, against all the reasons and facts in the case, pretend. Our learned jurist misconceives the case, and his evidence is irrelevant and inadmissible. Nothing can be concluded against the Church from the silence of the Gospels. If Mr. Derby could find in them any text that expressly, or by implication, denies that the power given to Peter descended to his successors, it would be to his purpose; for it would convict the Church of contradicting herself, since she teaches that the Gospels were given by divine inspiration. But their silence proves nothing, any more than a witness testifying that he did not see the accused commit a certain crime, proves that he did not commit it. Yet we do not concede that the Gospels are absolutely silent on the point. The words of our Lord, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," plainly imply the continuance of Peter as its foundation. And how was he to continue, but in his successors?

The author promised to "test the claims and faith of the Church by those authorities on which the Church herself relies, the early Saints, Fathers, and Popes, such as Augustine, Clement, Irenæus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Jerome, Athanasius, Leo, and others, whom the Church reveres." From these he was to draw his proofs, and only his *illustrations* from the Scriptures. That is, he undertook to refute the claims and faith of the Church

by those whom we regard as Catholic writers, and recognize as authorities in argument. Has he done it? Has he cited a single authority to the effect that the Church falsely claims that the power given to Peter as the Prince of the Apostles, as the Primate and visible head of the Church, descends to his successors? Not as we have seen. It is evident to common sense, if such Primacy was necessary to the Church in the time of Peter, when the Apostles were all living, all directed by the Holy Ghost, and all clothed with Apostolical authority in the whole Church, it was far more necessary after their death, and there remained, aside from the Apostolic See, no Apostolic power, as distinguished from the ordinary Episcopal power. The Bishops succeed to the Apostles in the Episcopacy, in so far as the Apostles were Bishops, but not in the Apostleship, in so far as they were Apostles; they succeed to the Episcopal, but not to the Apostolic power, and unless the successors of Peter succeed to him in his Apostleship and Primacy, the Primacy and Apostleship expired with him and the rest of the Apostles, and no Apostolic power remains in the Church. The reason for continuing the Primacy of Peter after his death was far stronger than the reason for instituting it in his person. Hence, we find all the Fathers asserting its continuance in Peter's successors. Thus St. Chrysostom, speaking of our Lord, says, "Cur sanguinem effudit? Ut has emeret oves, quas Petro et successoribus ejus tradidit."* "Manet," says St. Leo Magnus, as cited by Father Cercia, "dispositio veritatis, et Beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine Petræ perseverans, suscepta Ecclesia gubernacula non reliquit: perseverat videlicet Petrus et vivit in successoribus suis."†

That the bishops of Rome are the legitimate successors of Peter, and that he lives and speaks in them with the plenitude of the Apostolic authority, is the uniform tradition of the Church. To this fact may be cited St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, St. Athanasius, Sozomen, Eulogius Alexandrinus, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Prudentius, St. Prosper, Sulpitius,

* *De Sacerdotis*, Lib. II., Tom. 1, p. 454.

† *Sermo. II., de Anniv. Assumpt. sue*, Tract. de Romano Pontifice, Sect. 1, Lect. XI. Neapoli, 1850.

Theodoret, Isidore, Freculphus, Addo Vienensis, the Popes Damasus, Innocent I., Leo Magnus, Gelasius, John III., Gregory Magnus, Adrian I., Nicholas I., indeed all the Popes who have written any thing touching the question, for they all with one accord claim to be successors of St. Peter, and to hold their authority on the ground of their being the occupants of his See. And to these we may add the testimony of the first five councils, which comprise together more than twelve hundred ancient bishops, the great majority of whom were Greeks.* This is enough to satisfy any reasonable man acquainted with the subject, and a sufficient answer to Mr. Derby on his own grounds, for he promised to prove his case from our own witnesses.

Mr. Derby pretends that whatever power was given to Peter, the same power was given to all the Apostles alike, because he said to all indifferently, "feed ye," "go into all the world," "teach the Gospel." But he forgets that our Lord did not say to all indifferently, "feed my lambs," "feed my sheep," but to Peter only. He said, indeed, to them all, go into all the world and teach the Gospel, and thus gave them Apostolic power, but to none of them save Peter did he deliver the keys, to none of them save Peter did he say, "when thou art converted confirm thy brethren," to no other did he give the special charge of his lambs, his sheep, his whole flock; and therefore St. Chrysostom, who probably understood the Scriptures and traditions of the Church as well as our New England jurist, calls Peter the Coryphæus of the Apostles, and the head and mouth, *caput et os*, of the Apostolic body.

Mr. Derby, furthermore, thinks that Paul, not Peter, planted the Church of Rome, and the primacy, if affirmed of any one should be affirmed of Paul and not of Peter. "The Romish Church,—why could he not have written *Roman*, and thus have written good English?—look

* See Father Caccia's work, just referred to, Sect. II., Lect. I., where the testimony of all these is cited at length, and which we would also give at length did our limits permit; and most of whom we shall have, perhaps, occasion to cite, as we proceed. On this whole question we refer Mr. Derby to the work we have cited, and also to the learned work on *The Primacy of the Apostolic See*, by Archbishop Kenrick. 4th edition, Baltimore. 1855.

(looks) principally to Peter, but it appears from Holy writ that St. Paul was the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and the principal, if not the sole founder of the Church of Rome." He labors in the remainder of this second letter to prove this. We cite his proofs at length.

"It is true the Lord appeared in a vision to St. Peter, to dispel his impressions as to the impurity of the Gentiles, but it does not appear that St. Peter, for many years, went out of Asia, while St. Paul, enlightened by a heavenly vision, and highly educated, having been reared at Tarsus, distinguished for its schools, and at the feet of Gamaliel, a learned and leading Pharisee, and being born a Roman citizen, was converted to the faith, and sent forth the eloquent expounder of Christianity, and endowed also with the power of miracles. Refer to the Acts and Epistles. Who was the principal actor and author? St. Paul. How often did he visit Rome, and how long did he reside there? He was there twice or thrice and for years. His epistles most of them bear date from Rome. Look at their conclusion. Read them all, and you will find he was in Asia, Egypt, Arabia, Thrace, Greece, Macedonia, Italy, Spain, and many other regions, founding churches and preaching the Gospel. Examine his Epistle to the Galatians from Rome, chapters one and two, from the fourteenth verse of the first, to the sixteenth verse of the second chapter, and note his remarkable narrative of the heavenly vision, and his mission to the Gentiles. How it was three years after he commenced that mission, before he visited the disciples in Jerusalem, where he conferred with Peter and James, (the first bishop of Jerusalem,) the Lord's brother, and after a visit of but fifteen days to Peter, left Judea for Cilicia and Syria; how he travelled on his mission for fourteen years, and then returned to Jerusalem where he found James and John, as well as Cephas, 'pillars of the Church,' and Peter performing his mission to the circumcised; how he met Peter at Antioch; how Peter at first associated with the Gentiles at meals, and when the Jews appeared withdrew, and how severely Paul reproved him for this *tergiversation*, 'and withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed.' See Galatians 11: 13, 14, and note that he afterwards returned to Rome, and thence addressed his apostolic letters to the bishops of various churches. Does not all this show any supremacy or infallibility on the part of St. Peter in the days of the Apostles? He may have subsequently visited Rome, and his martyrdom may have occurred there, and his blood have cemented the foundations of the Church which St. Paul had reared there, but St. Paul was the bold, learned, eloquent, and effective preacher of the Gospel to the heathen, and at least coördinate with St. Peter, the oldest and probably least instructed of the Disciples, who must have been an old

man when he reached Rome more than eighteen years after the death of our Saviour."—pp. 12—14.

Is it not a little singular, if our jurist is right, that the Church of Rome never thought of claiming the Primacy for St. Paul instead of St. Peter? She must have known, if such was the fact, that St. Paul was her founder and first Bishop; how do you account, then, for her fixing upon Peter, according to Mr. Derby, a far less worthy character, and altogether inferior as a man and a scholar? How do you account for the uniform tradition of the Church throughout the whole world, a tradition never questioned, so far as known, before the heretic Marsilius of Padua, in the fourteenth century, that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome? How account for the fact that, with such preponderating evidence as Mr. Derby supposes, in favor of St. Paul, there is not a vestige of proof that any one ever thought of calling the See of Rome St. Paul's See? Is it not the most rational solution of the difficulty, after all, to conclude that the Church of Rome had no option in the case, that she called the Roman See, Peter's See, simply because it was his See, —a fact about which she could no more be mistaken than we about the fact who is at this moment Archbishop of New York. Perhaps the early Christians were not such blunderheads as Mr. Derby would have us believe. The heretics of the early ages, like heretics in all ages, were an ignorant, blundering set, no doubt, and the remains we have of their writings and speculations indicate, as Clement of Alexandria said of the Greeks, that "they could believe anything save the truth;" but all the remains we have of the early orthodox Christians, prove that they had, with the poor, the simple, the oppressed, the best talent of their age on their side. We do great injustice to the men who immediately succeeded the Apostles, if we suppose there were among them none who were men of enlarged and cultivated minds, of liberal education, and who were inferior to none in their times, or even in succeeding times. The fragments of their works which have escaped the wreck of time prove it. The second century was almost ushered in before the last of the Apostles, St. John, departed this life, and the men who

1857.]

were formed in that century, and wrote in it, or at the opening of the third, were men of learning, ability, and some of them of vast attainments. These were all men of whom the Christian world even to-day might be proud. When we come down later to the last half of the third century and to the fourth we find the Christian writers were the great men in genius, in talent, in learning, in philosophy, and eloquence of their age, and of an age by no means sunk in gross ignorance and enveloped in thick darkness. Mr. Derby forgets that the Christian Church was founded in the most enlightened and cultivated epoch of antiquity, and was established in the most enlightened centres of the Roman empire, amidst the most violent opposition of the heathen world. If her first Apostles were chosen from the humbler classes of Judea, we must remember that they were supernaturally endowed, and not presume on their ignorance or that of the primitive believers. The Acts of the early martyrs and confessors betray no such ignorance or credulity as is often supposed. Numerous councils had been held by the Christians prior to Constantine, and we find that when the Bishops from all parts of the world assembled at Nice in the beginning of the fourth century, they were all well aware of the faith and discipline of the Church, and that the Church herself was as thoroughly organized, had as regular an order, whether as to her government, her liturgy, or her modes of conducting her affairs, as at any subsequent period. Never was there a theory invented less necessary to explain the phenomena of Church history than the Theory of Development.

Does Mr. Derby doubt that Luther performed as to the Reformation the part usually ascribed to him? Does he consider it uncertain whether Luther did or did not publish his theses at Wittenberg, in 1517, and that he burnt at the same place the Papal Bull condemning his heresies? Which was the greater event, the acts of Luther or the establishing of the Chair of Peter at Rome, the founding of the Church in the capital of heathenism? What was to prevent St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, or St. Ambrose from being as well informed of the latter as Mr. Derby is of the former? They were nearer in space and time to the event than he is to Luther. They lived in

one and the same empire, under one and the same government, and the means of communication of all parts of the empire with Rome, prior to the irruption of the Barbarians, were neither few nor difficult, nor even dilatory. Just suppose, what is very supposable, that the early Christians of the empire took a deep interest in their religion, and that they knew as well what they were about as Mr. Derby knows what he is about, and the tradition that the See of Rome was Peter's See becomes conclusive, and can be questioned by no honest man capable of reasoning on such subjects.

Mr. Derby concludes that St. Peter did not, and that St. Paul did, plant the Church of Rome. But he adduces no evidence that St. Paul was ever Bishop of Rome, or that St. Peter was not the first Bishop, and therefore the founder of the See. To establish the claims of Peter it is not necessary to suppose that he was the first who proclaimed the Gospel in the city of Rome, or that when he transferred his chair from Antioch to Rome, there were no Christian converts there. It is only necessary to prove that he established his See there. Certain it is that St. Paul was not the first to plant the Christian faith in the Eternal City; for we learn from his Epistle to the Romans, written before he had visited Rome, that there were Christians and converts both from the Jews and Gentiles there, whose faith was spoken of in all the world. St. Paul, indeed, resided some time at Rome, and labored as an Apostle there, but that does not prove that he was or that St. Peter was not the Bishop, any more than the labors of Archbishop Bedini as Secretary of the Propaganda prove that he is and that Pius the Ninth is not the Supreme Pontiff. St. Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, but that does not make him the Primate of the Church, or make it not true that our Lord committed to Peter the care of the whole flock, both Jews and Gentiles. That he labored with Peter in founding the Church of Rome we do not deny, and therefore to this day Rome honors him as one of the patrons of her See, and the Popes in their official documents invoke him along with St. Peter.

That St. Peter was guilty of "tergiversation" at Antioch and that St. Paul withstood him to the face is not

certain, and till its certainty is established we cannot be called upon to respond to the allegation. It is not certain that the Cephas spoken of in the text was Peter the Apostle, and if he was, it does not follow that Paul reprehended him otherwise than as an inferior may reprehend a superior. We know elsewhere that St. Peter and St. Paul agreed as to the binding nature of the Jewish law, and the dispute between them at Antioch, if dispute there was, did not concern doctrine, but the propriety or impropriety of Peter's avoiding, in the presence of the Jews, eating with the Gentiles. The very worst that can be said is that the conduct of Cephas was reprehensible. Even if this Cephas was Peter the Apostle, it proves nothing against his *infallibility*, and at most would only prove that he was not *impeccable*. Now no man, however strongly he asserts the infallibility of the Pope in teaching, maintains that he is impeccable in his personal conduct. Popes go to confession, and to simple priests, as the rest of us. But Mr. Derby forgets that St. Peter was an inspired Apostle, and that therefore his teaching was infallible, even on Protestant principles. If he believes the Apostles were inspired by the Holy Ghost and divinely assisted to teach, he must take care how he impugns Peter's infallibility.

But enough for the present. We have dwelt at great length upon the second letter of Mr. Derby, because we have wished to meet fairly and to the advantage of our readers the points he has made. Nearly all the important matter of his whole book he touches upon in this Letter. We shall pass more lightly and more rapidly over the rest. But our readers must have patience with us, for we write not solely for Mr. Derby's special benefit, or for the sole purpose of refuting his assertions in the respect that they are his. In refuting him, we refute the whole class of popular anti-Popery writers, and perform a disagreeable, though perhaps not a useless task.